

# Radical Abolitionist.

"PROCLAIM LIBERTY THROUGHOUT ALL THE LAND, UNTO ALL THE INHABITANTS THEREOF."—LEV. XXV. 10.

VOLUME I.]

NEW YORK, JUNE, 1856.

[NUMBER 11.]

The Radical Abolitionist.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.

Is Published Monthly,

AT 48 BEEKMAN STREET, NEW YORK.

BY THE AMERICAN ABOLITION SOCIETY.

## Terms.

PER ANNUM, OR FOR TWELVE NUMBERS.

SINGLE COPIES.....	\$0.50
FIVE COPIES directed to one person.....	2.00
EIGHT COPIES, do. do. ....	3.00
FOURTEEN COPIES, do. do. ....	5.00
THIRTY COPIES, do. do. ....	10.00

Payments in advance.

✂ All letters must be post-paid.

✂ Small change, or sums less than one dollar, may be sent in post-office stamps; or, if stamps cannot be procured, one dollar may be sent, and the balance will be sent back in stamps, deducting postage.

## PROSPECTUS.

The "RADICAL ABOLITIONIST" proposes a proclamation of "liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof." It demands of the American Government and the American People, the immediate and unconditional abolition of American Slavery.

It makes this demand on behalf of three millions of Americans already enslaved, on behalf of twenty millions more in process of becoming enslaved, and in behalf of the untold millions of their posterity, who must be enslaved for ages to come, unless American Slavery be overthrown.

It urges this demand in the name of humanity chattelized, republicanism disgraced, religion dishonored, the Holy Scriptures perverted, the Saviour blasphemed, the laws of nature and of nature's God trampled under foot.

It denies that the Federal Government, under the Federal Constitution, has either a moral or a political right to tolerate slavery, in any of the States belonging to the Federal Union, for a single day.

"The United States SHALL guarantee to EVERY State in the Union a republican form of government."—*Constitution.*

"The foundation of republican government is the right of every citizen, in his person and property, and in their management."—*Jefferson.*

It denies that "the reserved rights of the States" include any such right as that of holding property in man, as no such "right" can exist; and Mr. Madison tells us that the Federal Convention would not permit the Constitution to recognize any such right.—*Vide Madison Papers.*

It affirms that the Constitution unequivocally inhibits the States from maintaining slavery.

"No State shall pass any bill of attainder, or laws impairing the obligation of contracts." And "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."—*Constitution.*

It affirms that the Constitution was formed by "the people of the United States," (all of them,) "to secure the blessings of LIBERTY for (themselves) and (their) posterity," without exception or distinction of race or color. And hence, no portion of "the people of the United States" can be constitutionally enslaved, and the declared object of the Constitution requires the Federal Government to "secure the blessings of liberty" to each and all of them.

If the Constitution is not available for these purposes, it is of no practical value, it is condemned by its own high professions, and the people have no alternative left them but to provide a better government for their protection, or become the serfs of the petty oligarchy of three hundred thousand slaveholders, who are now suffered to control and insult a great nation.

The 'RADICAL ABOLITIONIST' recognizes as valid law no unrighteous enactments. It affirms, with all the great writers on Common Law, "that statutes against fundamental morality are void;" that "no human laws have any validity if contrary to the law of God, and such of them as are valid derive all their force, mediately, or immediately, from this original."—*FORTESCUE.*

On this ground, as well as from the admitted absence of any positive law in this country, establishing slavery; from the known incompetency of the colonial legislatures under British common law, to legalize it; from the ascertained illegality of the African slave trade, by which the colonies were supplied with slaves; and from the unanimous declaration of the thirteen original States, in the very act of establishing their independent governments, that all just governments "are founded on the 'inalienable right' of 'all men' to 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,'" we affirm the absolute illegality of American slavery. We deny that it has any more legality in Georgia than in Massachusetts; that it is any more legal than the African slave-trade, or any other form of piracy and crime.

The object of this paper will be to unfold, explain, vindicate, and propagate these sentiments, calling on the people to maintain them at the ballot-box, thus providing for a federal legislature, a federal judiciary and a federal executive, that shall give them a national expression and force.

## INTERESTING CORRESPONDENCE.

DISCUSSION DECLINED.

We think it proper to place on record the following correspondence, as an indication of progress, hitherto, as well as for future reference, and as an item for the historian of the present struggle.

Office of American Abolition Society,  
48 Beekman st. N. Y., Jan. 16, 1856.

To the Executive Committee  
of the Am. Anti-Slavery Soc'y.

Gentlemen—We address you on behalf of the Executive Committee of the American Abolition Society. Your Society and ours are laboring for the overthrow of American Slavery. But if we rightfully understand your views, you do not agree with us in holding, as we do, the following positions, namely,

1. That slaveholding is *illegal*, in such a sense that the fundamental principles of civil law and jurisprudence require all Courts of Justice to treat it as illegal, in all their judicial decisions.

2. That Slavery in the United States and Territories is *unconstitutional*.

3. That the Federal Government, in its several departments, has constitutional power to prohibit and suppress slaveholding in all the States and Territories; and that the people of the United States ought to exercise the right of suffrage in the election of a Federal Administration to this end.

4. That the people could probably be persuaded to vote for the abolition of slavery as a means of preserving the Union, more readily than they could be persuaded to dissolve the Union on account of slavery;—the Union being desirable in itself, and there being nothing except slavery to prevent its being perpetuated.

Now, Gentlemen, in view of the practical importance of these points, it seems desirable that there should be a public discussion of them, that truth may be elicited by it, and that all abolitionists and the public at large may be

better enabled, in the light of it, to decide what ought to be done.

If we are mistaken in our views, we wish to be instructed and corrected, that we may pursue the better course. If our views are correct, we wish to have the evidence of their correctness exhibited, that they may be adopted and reduced to practice. In either case, we wish to have the friends of the slave *united in sentiment and action*, for securing in the best and most expeditious manner, the abolition of slavery. Open, public discussion, has ever been recognised, among abolitionists, as the natural element and safe guide of social reforms.

To such a discussion we invite you. We propose, if agreeable to you, that it be held in the city of New York, this winter, by an equal number of speakers on each side, not exceeding four, to be selected by each Committee, conducted under the ordinary rules of order, and presided over by an impartial Chairman, mutually appointed. If held in this city, we will pay the necessary travelling expenses of your speakers.

We will pay for a suitable hall, show-bills, advertising, &c. If any profits should (as we hope) accrue from a sale of tickets, at a price agreed upon, over and above such expenses, the profits shall be equally divided between the two Societies. But, if there should be a deficit, we will bear the burden alone. Perhaps a mutual committee should be appointed to attend to the direction of these particulars.

LEWIS TAPPAN,  
WM. GOODELL,  
S. S. JOCELYN,  
JAMES McCUNE SMITH.

REPLY.

Boston, Feb. 7, 1856.

To the Ex. Com. of the Am. Abolition Society:

Gentlemen—We have to acknowledge the receipt of a letter from you, dated January 16th, signed by Messrs. Lewis Tappan, William Goodell, S. S. Jocelyn, and J. McCune Smith, inviting us to a public discussion of certain points, of which the principal are the Constitutionality and Legality of Slavery, and the Constitutional power of the General Government to abolish Slavery in the States.

This invitation we beg respectfully to decline, for the following reasons, among others:

1. We deem the constitutionality and legality of slavery as generally understood, and the exclusive jurisdiction of the slave States over it within their limits, to be justly regarded by the whole nation as self-evident and axiomatic facts—as much so as the existence of slavery, or of the Constitution itself. We do not flatter ourselves that we can make them any more plain to minds which do not discern them. We do not feel called upon, therefore, at present, to expend any portion of our time on so fruitless an attempt, or to expose ourselves to the just ridicule with which both parties to such a discussion must be regarded by all well informed and intelligent persons.

2. Even were the questions suggested such as we could consent to treat as open ones, we should still decline such a discussion as you invite. We believe in free discussion as the great instrument of reforms. It is the vital principle of our movement; and it strikes us as somewhat singular, that, while our

platform has ever been open to the fullest consideration of every legitimate question, *pro* and *con*, and while the unconstitutionality of slavery has been freely discussed at our meetings by members of your Society, such an invitation should be extended to us. Hence we consider a dialectic tournament, such as you propose, alike gratuitous and unprofitable. We should therefore, on any subject and under any circumstances, decline such a challenge as you have sent us.

3. And, thirdly, were these reasons not sufficient for us, we apprehend from the antecedents of a majority of the Committee through which you have communicated with us, that, should we meet you in the way proposed, we might seem to recognise as genuine Abolitionists and honorable antagonists, men in no wise entitled to be so regarded, and who might thus acquire a power to injure the anti-slavery enterprise in quarters where their course and characters are little known, which they could obtain in no other manner.

There are other reasons which would lead us to the same decision; but these we conceive to be sufficient for the purposes of this correspondence.

In behalf and by order of the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society,

SAMUEL MAY, JR.,  
Secretary, *pro tem*.

N. B. The Secretary would add that the above reply was acted upon and adopted by the Committee on the 25th of January last; but that owing to the absence from Boston of the gentleman who had in his possession the original draft, he has only been able to-day to make and forward this copy.

#### REVIEW OF THE PRECEDING.

The Committee assign three reasons for declining our invitation to discuss with us the questions of the legality and unconstitutionality of slavery, and the power of the General Government to abolish slavery in the States. We will look at them in their order.

The first is, that the legality and constitutionality of slavery, and the exclusive jurisdiction of the slave States over it, are "self-evident and axiomatic facts;"—insomuch that the discussion, on either side, would expose each of the parties to "just ridicule."

The slavery party will be delighted with this discovery, especially as coming from the old pioneer Anti-Slavery Society, presided over by Wm. Lloyd Garrison. Their own Judges, Porter and Matthews, had been unable to discover "any positive laws" by which the slaves are held. In their judicial decisions they had proclaimed this to the world, by the side of their own decisions, and the concurrent decisions of all the Southern Courts, up to 1850, that slavery could not be sustained without such "positive law," and many slaves had been liberated by them, on this principle, because they had been carried out from under the local jurisdiction wherein they were held. Senator Mason, too, the author of the Fugitive Slave Bill, had objected to a proposed Jury trial of the fugitives, on the express ground that the States had "no positive laws" for enslaving them, and the Courts, (even the Federal Courts) if compelled to go into the investigation, would have to set them at liberty! Senator Mason may now dismiss his fears. Mr. Garrison and the American Anti-Slavery Society have discovered that the legality of slavery is an "axiomatic fact." Patrick Henry, too, had declared to the Virginia Convention, that Congress, under the Constitution, had power to

"declare all slaves free." But Patrick Henry, though a member of the Federal Convention, and a slaveholder, was mistaken. The Constitutional and "exclusive jurisdiction of the slave States over slavery within their limits," is a "self-evident and axiomatic fact." So says Mr. Garrison. So says the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society; who must have been exceedingly sorry to say this. And certainly they must know.

But how long have these been "self-evident and axiomatic facts"? In 1836, Rev. Samuel J. May and N. P. Rogers, Esq. (both Garrisonians) in two able articles in the Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine, published by the American Anti-Slavery Society, maintained precisely the opposite view of the subject, and Mr. Garrison was not understood to dissent from them. When the division of the Society took place, in 1840, it was not on account of any difference of views on this subject. Some time afterwards, Wendell Phillips came out against the Constitution as pro-slavery, and advocated a dissolution of the Union. Mr. Garrison, we have been informed, dissented. So did S. S. Foster, Abby Kelly, and others. It was not until the Annual Meeting in May, 1844, that a majority of the Society adopted the views of Mr. Phillips, over a respectable dissenting minority, and thereupon raised the flag of disunion.

Nor did they then consider or treat the views they held as "axiomatic and self-evident;"—too plain to be discussed without incurring "just ridicule." Wendell Phillips elaborately reviewed Spooner's Argument, and assailed William Goodell's. He was answered by both, and was silenced. In that connection or about that time, he was driven to the concession that "an honest construction of the Constitution would make it anti-slavery," and he was asked to consent to that "honest construction." He has since held the discussion to be "an unprofitable one," and objected against its discussion (as he did at their Anniversary last May) on their own platform. Within two years past, their Society published, and are still circulating a tract designed to prove the Constitution pro-slavery—a tract which, by the bye, has been answered without drawing out a rejoinder. Does the circulation of that argument 'expose them to just ridicule'? At their Anniversary, last May, in New York, Henry C. Wright publicly challenged William Goodell, who chanced to be present, to a discussion of the subject, on the spot. At first he excused himself, as not having come into the meeting for that purpose, and not wishing to interrupt their business. But Mr. Garrison urged him, and he consented. Wright, Garrison and Burleigh, entered largely into the discussion, which occupied a great part of the day. Do they think they 'exposed themselves to just ridicule' on that occasion? At a time when scores and hundreds, not to say thousands, of their fellow-citizens, including able statesmen, lawyers, and other educated men, are avowing their conviction that slavery is illegal, unconstitutional, and under the control of the Federal Government, would it indeed 'expose them to just ridicule' to meet them in an open, manly discussion?

Their whole system of anti-slavery measures—including a dissolution of the Union, is based

on the assumption of their theory of the legality and constitutionality of slavery, and of the exclusive jurisdiction of the slave States over it. And would a public examination of the grounds of that assumption, 'expose them to just ridicule'? Assuredly it would not, if their position could be sustained.

2. The second reason for declining the discussion is a very remarkable one. It is because they "believe in free discussion as the great instrument of reforms," because "it is the vital principle of their movement," because their platform 'has ever been open to the fullest consideration of every legitimate question,' and because 'the unconstitutionality of slavery has been freely discussed at (their) meetings, by members of (our) Society.'

How does this agree with the plea that the discussion of the "self-evident and axiomatic facts" would expose them to "just ridicule"? Is it only on their "own platform" (i. e. in the meetings of their own Society) that the discussion of these questions can be otherwise than ridiculous? Or is it only in *their own* meetings that they can afford to appear ridiculous? Or shall we infer that they claim the monopoly of getting up and of presiding over ridiculous discussions?

And is it only in the meetings of *one* of the antagonistic parties, that the most free and untrammelled discussion can be held? Edmund Quincy presided at the discussion last May. He did himself honor by repressing irregularities on his own side. He seemed disposed to do right, and to do as well as he could. But in spite of this, the venerable Mrs. Mott of Philadelphia felt impelled to rise and protest against the 'incessant questionings which gave William Goodell no opportunity to answer them.' This is mentioned only to show the desirableness of an orderly discussion, presided over by an impartial umpire, and kept within parliamentary rules. This is what *our* Committee proposed. They thought it possible that Mr. Garrison and his associates might have declined discussion with us at Boston, because they did not wish to meet us *on our* platform. We therefore invited them to an unobjectionable one, under mutual arrangements, and under circumstances that would ensure sufficient time, without detriment to other business, to go through the whole subject, with the deliberate care that its importance demands.

3. The third "reason" lies outside of our elements of logic. The Committee decline discussing with us, lest they should seem to recognise us as genuine abolitionists and honorable antagonists, and lest such recognition, on their part, should bring us into notice, and give us a power, which we could not otherwise possess, to injure the anti-slavery cause, in quarters where our course and characters are not known! They should have thought of this, last May. Or did they, or do they think an invitation to discussion, *on their platform*, to look less like an endorsement of our anti-slavery character, than meeting us in a discussion, elsewhere?

Alas, for us! What shall we do? This comes of being heretics, dissenting from the prescribed creed, and being out of the pale of the true Mother Church, with the apostolic succession on our side. Whenever we can join

with Judge Kane, Mr. Toombs, Franklin Pierce, Mr. Garrison, Mr. Phillips, and the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, in affirming the legality of slavery (in the absence of positive law,) its constitutionality, and the exclusive jurisdiction of the slave States over it, to be 'self-evident and axiomatic facts,' we shall perhaps come into favor, and our anti-slavery character will be redeemed! Till then, we must submit to be heretics, and to remain in the obscurity from which nothing but the notice of the Boston Committee can raise us.

Having disposed of all the reasons which the Committee *did* give, it remains to inquire what may have been the reasons which they did *not* give. We "decline" (say the Committee) "for the following reasons, among others." And again, "There are other reasons, which would lead us to the same decision." Undoubtedly there are.

If, in the year 1836, or at any time thenceforward until 1840, Rev. Samuel J. May, N. P. Rogers, Esq., Alvan Stewart, Esq., and others, who then held the illegality and unconstitutionality of slavery, had invited Henry A. Wise, Wm. L. Marcy, Edward Everett, and others, to discuss the question with them, and if the invitation had been declined, abolitionists and the public generally would have easily conjectured the reason. And so they will now.

The preceding remarks were penned soon after the answer of the Committee at Boston was received. A press of other matter has prevented their earlier publication. In the mean time, the rapid progress of our doctrines has compelled Mr. Garrison and his friends to enter upon the discussion anew! Even Theodore Parker, who stands high in their esteem, has so nearly approximated to our views, that Mr. Garrison has felt the necessity of devoting some columns of his *Liberator* to a review of a paragraph or two in his New York lecture. More recently, the terse and effective speech of Gen. Granger in Congress, and its high commendation by Horace Greeley, of the New York Tribune, has stirred up Mr. Garrison to another desperate attempt to parry off the blow inflicted by it—with what success the readers of Frederick Douglass' prompt and searching review of it can best judge. And finally, the National Anti-Slavery Standard, in order to "show up the fallacious sophistry of Spooner's book, as well as that of all other quibbling plausibilities which the self-styled 'Radical Abolitionists' are just now so assiduously pushing upon the notice of the anti-slavery public," has exhumed and offers for sale "some copies" of "Wendell Phillips' admirable review of Spooner," which (he omits to say) was "used up" to the silencing of Mr. Phillips, in the "Second Part" of Mr. Spooner, now bound up with the first Essay, and for sale at our Depository.

How far these efforts at a discussion of the constitutional question are exposing our Garrisonian friends to "just ridicule," we will not undertake to determine. For ourselves, we have no fears of this result to our side of the house, so long as such indications as these, and the congratulatory letters we are daily receiving from every part of the free States, with the changed tone of many important public jour-

nals, bear testimony to the increasing power upon the public mind, of the truths we are disseminating.

#### A VOICE FROM THE GERMANS.

The following is a translation by a friend, of the leading editorial in the German newspaper of April 19th, 1856, printed in Albany.

"Down with Slavery!  
Live Abolition!"

Motto—"Slavery has only one right—the right to be killed."—Gerrit Smith.

That there can be in America, Europeans, who either take slavery shamefully into protection as a blessing, or deduce it from principles of social economy as a necessity to republican state-organization, belongs to those facts which place in a strong light those who pretend to have left the shores of despotic Europe in order to find here a free country!

From the first moment of our treading the soil of the American Republic, nothing has so much astonished us as this disgraceful sympathy of so many of our immigrants with the *men of the whip*. They who at home preached death to tyrants, quietly yield themselves here to speaking in favor of kidnappers, of the slave trade, and of the system of the knout, in its worst form.

The shrieking halloo which rings from the throats of these European men-hunters, is all the more repugnant when it is accompanied with the shrillest tones from the cymbals of Perfidy, Lying, and Calumny.

There are those footpads of the New York State Gazette (*New Yorker Staats Zeitung*) for instance, who pretend to be the friends of the white laborer, and publish at the same moment the basest tirades against the suppression of slavery, against the all-binding principles of human rights. Such a rabble dares even to coquette with Freedom, and to use Abolition as an allurements. When in the winter of 1854—5, the working-men's movement arose in New York, there straightway sprang up a German pro-slavery sheet, the *New Yorker Staats-Zeitung*, which at once took the field against the white laborers. We still remember how Monsieur Eickhoff came into Washington Hall in great distress, and a universal cry of indignation arose among the working people of New York against this slave-breeding organ.

This same villainous sheet has the merit, moreover, of having contributed its influence to sow discord in the Turner Society; thinking no means too wicked for attaining its base ends. Like a common harlot, it looks amorously on all sides. To-day it tears down the priestcraft, to-morrow it denounces the infidels; now it blows a blast on the communistic horn, and now again it stands forth in behalf of Southern magnates, as the defender of the rights of property. In a word, it is fit for any business, provided only it will pay.

It is especially the duty of all the revolutionary European emigrants to fight incessantly and inexorably against such rascality, that we may not be placed in a class with these miserable tools of stupid Hunkerdom.

Fresher gales are already blowing from the West. Every day the radical press of the West comes out more resolutely, and we trust

we shall live to see that day when it will hoist the banner of Abolition with the same determination with which it has flung the challenge in the face of the religious blockheads.

As for ourselves, we are entirely of the opinion of Gerrit Smith, that an anti-slavery party which does not start with the stand point of Abolition, is without root, and must fall to the ground; and that it is just as foolish merely to dam up slavery, as to attempt to stop the conflagration of a city by seeking to extinguish the flames at one end, while incendiaries are allowed to spread them wider and wider at the other."

The same German newspaper of the 24th instant, publishes the Call for the Convention of Radical Abolitionists, with the following comment:

"We have already declared ourselves agreed with the fundamental principles of the abolitionists, and we repeat it this day, with the remark that we hold it an unparalleled absurdity to take anything into protection and defend it, even under its worst aspects, to the last. *Half-wayism*, must, necessarily, from its nature, be the destruction of every party. The mere limitation of slavery is, (as in such cases measures of prevention generally are,) in direct opposition to its radical overthrow. Should an indignant Republican propose, in order to blot out monarchy, to strike a compromise with it, or limit to a certain extent its sway, he would be laughed to scorn. Grant that slavery is a base wickedness, (and that it is, in itself, and in its consequences,) and you must destroy it, root and branch. Property acquired in such a way, as that through traffic in human beings, has no claim to the protection of law. Here applies what Voltaire said of Religion, "Let us crush the infamy. *Ecrasons l'infamie*."

THE "REPUBLICAN" MOVEMENT is rapidly losing the confidence of abolitionists of all schools and of anti-slavery men of all shades. The religious anti-slavery press, as well as the political, is beginning to speak out, very distinctly, in tones of dissatisfaction. There is not heart, nor conscience, nor faith enough in the present movement, to satisfy the religious anti-slavery sentiment of Christians. Some time since, we copied a brief but pithy paragraph of the Wesleyan, expressing want of confidence in the movement. We have now before us a longer article of the American Baptist, (the organ of Free Mission Baptists) in which "Republicanism"—so called—is dissected with a master's hand. We regret our want of room for it. We can only copy a few sentences.

"The new party will defend itself against the assaults of the enemy, as best it may, but is self-interdicted from making any assaults in return. If it succeeds, therefore, it gains nothing—the utmost success at which it aims being, not to lose. Victory it seeks not; conquest it eschews; it merely hopes to maintain itself. If, on the contrary, it is defeated, the loss it suffers is irreparable. Any attempt to recover the ground from which it has been driven, is a violation of its pledge to abstain from aggression. Let Kansas, the present battle ground, for example, once be made a slave State—no matter by what flagrant aggression, and it ceases to be battle ground. It

must be abandoned to its fate, for the founders of the party 'disclaim any intention to interfere with slavery in the States where it exists.' A party based on such principles, and imposing on itself such restrictions, is foredoomed to defeat and dissolution."

The following is from the veteran E. Smith, editor of the Christian Statesman, and one of the founders of the Wesleyan Church in the West:—

"With all the so-called Republican and anti-Nebraska sentiment in the North, I fear there is but very little real hatred of slavery for slavery's own sake—very little true sympathy with the wronged and throttled bondman. We do not regard ourselves as 'bound with him,' but only as injured in our pecuniary and political interests by those that oppress him. Oh that our Republicanism was the Democracy of a Bible Christianity."

### Radical Abolitionist.

NEW YORK, JUNE, 1856.

**TAKE NOTICE,** that we do not make any charges for papers sent to those who have not ordered or subscribed for them.

Letters for the Editor of the Radical Abolitionist, or for the Treasurer of the American Abolition Society, should be addressed to Post office box No. 1212, No. 48 Beekman st. New York. We shall then get them without the delay and extra charge of two cents for delivery by the penny post.

#### MONTHLY, OR SEMI-MONTHLY?

Shall the next volume of the "Radical Abolitionist" be continued as a monthly? Or shall it be issued semi-monthly?

This question has been agitated among our friends in the country, for some time past. One of our patrons, DR. J. C. HARRINGTON, of Fulton, N. Y., wrote us last February, in favor of the change, adding—

"I propose that one hundred of its subscribers pay five dollars each, and that you try the experiment for one year—say; commence the first of April next, and you may set me down for ten, for this object, provided the balance can, in any way be raised."

The Executive Committee of the American Abolition Society, by whom the paper is published, were not prepared, at that time, to take definite action; but took the matter under consideration and advisement, and, after some discussion, referred the question to their sub-committee on Publication, to deliberate and report thereon. This Report, presented and adopted at the last monthly meeting (for April, was, in substance, as follows—

"That a proposition and subscription list be opened in the May and June numbers of the Radical Abolitionist, to raise the additional sum, (\$500,) and if, by July, the sums subscribed be sufficient, the proposed semi-monthly Radical Abolitionist, be commenced, with the commencement of the second volume, being the next August number. The price to subscribers to the new semi-monthly volume to be, of course, double the price of the present monthly.

The present terms, it will be noticed by referring to the imprint, are fifty cents &c. "per annum, or for 12 Numbers." This was so stated, in anticipation of a possible change to a semi-monthly. So that advance payments of fifty cents &c. made at any time during the present volume, and running onward into the second volume, would, by the Terms, run out at the end of the twelve numbers, whether issued monthly or semi-monthly.

Persons, also, who have subscribed, or who may hereafter wish to subscribe, the amount of fifty cents to have the paper sent to a friend, may continue to do so, on (substantially) the same terms, and to the same effect. That is, their fifty cents will furnish the same twelve numbers as before, only they will all be sent in six months instead of twelve months.

The great benefit of publishing more frequently would be the furnishing of a greater amount and richer variety of matter, and giving more seasonably whatever relates to passing or expected events. As it now is, much important information becomes stale before it can be printed, and, even then, for want of room, must be suppressed altogether. Much original prepared matter, embracing trains of thought deemed important, are accumulating without any prospects of being published. The errors we have to grapple with, are poured forth from hundreds of huge sheets, weekly and daily, while the truths we would teach are waiting to find a scanty utterance in our little sheet, monthly. It is hard work to write under the consciousness of such disadvantages.

One reason why we should need the additional fund of \$500 for a semi-monthly, is because we fear the loss of subscribers consequent on the increase of price. And besides this, the change may involve additional expenses in various ways—additional clerk-hire—perhaps additional help in the editorial department, or assistance for the Corresponding Secretary, who acts both as Secretary and as Editor. Those, then, who desire the proposed change, must do something to aid it in addition to their own subscriptions for the paper, or for the general funds of the Society.

#### Form of subscription to the additional fund.

The undersigned agree to pay the Publishers of the Radical Abolitionist, the sums affixed to our names, in aid of the semi-monthly publication of the paper.

Names	P. O. Address	State.
-------	---------------	--------

#### THE REPUBLICAN PRESS AND THE PITTSBURGH CONVENTION.

The Radical Abolitionists are not alone in distrusting, or rather, in repudiating the wire-workers, who managed the late Pittsburg Convention. That portion of them who have been and still are earnest and honest in maintaining the principles of "non-extension" and the issue of "no more slave States," are now beginning to find themselves and their objects as essentially ignored and spurned aside as those who are intent on the abolition of slavery in the States. Take the following as specimens of their language.

"PLATFORM MAKERS AT WASHINGTON.—The Anti-Nebraska members of Congress, anticipating the action of the National Republican Convention, are industriously engaged in making a platform, whereupon everybody opposed to the Administration can stand in the next campaign. In our opinion, their self-allotted task is a work of supererogation, and that, like most other works of the sort, it will have no result with which the workmen themselves will be satisfied. We take it that the people will see to this business of platform making, that these gentlemen are working without a warrant, and hence, that nobody will be bound by their action. Nevertheless, if they choose to amuse themselves, in their leisure hours, when the House is not in

session in making cob houses, we know of no one inclined to interrupt their fun."—*Chicago Tribune*.

The above, from the Chicago Tribune, expresses our sentiments to a dot. We only add that the more these unauthorized builders work at this business of platform making, the more will the people distrust their work. It has hitherto been the reproach of the old parties that their platform and candidates have been dictated by the members of Congress, and that their conventions have been held so near the Capitol that the members have attended en masse. We trust the party of Freedom is not about to adopt the vices of the Slavery parties.—*Free Democrat*.

We see in the above, needed notes of warning, for to tell the truth, we have great fears that the holy cause of universal freedom is fast being wrecked, so far as the organization of the Republican party, as it was conducted at Pittsburg, is capable of doing it. Where is the heart response that has come up from the liberty loving masses, to what was done then and there? We have not heard it. It was a Convention of politicians, many of them political trimmers, and faint-hearted conservatives. F. P. Blair, the old Hunker editor of the Washington Union, and now a Maryland slaveholder, was President, and not only that, was the pet of the Convention.—*Fon-du-lac Freeman*.

We know that men, anxious to achieve what they conceive to be an important point, are very apt for the time being to lose sight of those great principles which include not only the object so eagerly sought, but others of equal or still greater magnitude. There is danger at the present time that the Republican party, in its anxiety to establish freedom in Kansas, should overlook the great principle of freedom which is the foundation of this whole movement. We do not find fault with them for making the Kansas question a prominent one; it is so, and deserves to be regarded as one of the vital measures of the party, but it is so because there are other issues depending upon its decision of a still graver character. The object of the Republican party we understand to be to dethrone the Slave Power—to break the arm of that Black Oligarchy which has ruled this nation with a rod of iron. It is vain for Republicans to attempt to make the Kansas issue the only issue in this great struggle.—*Olive Branch*.

The *National Era* comes out with quite as cutting a review of the Pittsburg Convention as anything that has appeared in the "Radical Abolitionist"—not because the Convention did not come up to "Radical" views, (as the *Era* does not) but because the editor understands that the old "Free Soil" issues are quite as unceremoniously dismissed by them as ours are. He says—

"Not a few of those whom we have been accustomed to consider the most earnest opponents of the Slave Power are dissatisfied and distrustful. Their suspicions were first awakened by the Pittsburg Convention." . . . "The Address was a good one," but "rather vague and ambiguous." "The principle of slavery restriction by positive act of Congress, is really evaded. The first paragraph (of the Declaration) makes a show of asserting something, but whatever that may be, it is not the principle indicated above, or indeed any principle at all."

Having cited the language of the ordinance of 1787, and of the liberal conventions held in the free States, pending the controversy in regard to the Territories of the United States, in 1848—50, affirming the right and duty of Congress to prohibit slavery in all these Territories, the editor proceeds—

"The question arises, Why did not the Pittsburg Convention boldly re-affirm the same Principle, in terms equally unambiguous? We demand and shall attempt to secure the repeal of all laws which allow

the introduction of slavery into territories once consecrated to freedom—it says. What does this mean? Federal laws or territorial laws? 'Territories once consecrated to freedom!' Which are they? Kansas and Nebraska? Or, not only these, but New Mexico and Utah? 'Once consecrated to freedom.' We suppose, then, that if there be territories of the United States which have not once been consecrated to freedom, they are to be suffered to remain under a slave code, should it exist! Is this what the Convention meant!

The 'repeal of all laws which allow the introduction of slavery.' Pray, what are they? There may be no law at all; and then Slavery says, 'I will go and take possession—what prevents?' That is just the way slavery does get foothold. What would the policy of your negative resolve effect in such case? You cannot repeal laws that have no existence.

Again: 'And will resist by every constitutional means the existence of slavery in the territories of the United States.' Wonderful! 'Every constitutional means?' What is constitutional? General Cass says it is not constitutional to resist it by Congressional action—and so says the South. What says the Pittsburgh Convention? Nothing at all. It dodges the issue—it refuses to assert the Principle, 'Slavery prohibition by Congressional act in the territories of the United States.'

Instead of this vague, meaningless declaration, the Convention ought to have said, in plain, bold words,

'We insist upon the right of Congress to prohibit slavery by positive law in all the territories of the United States, and upon the immediate duty of exercising this right.'

The editor of the National Era then proceeds to review the recent course of prominent editors and politicians in the Republican ranks, in equally caustic language—

"Look at the columns of the Republican press, and you would hardly know whether the doctrine of slavery prohibition by Congress is entertained by it or not. And so with expressions of opinion by prominent men who have become associated with the Republican movement. For example, we have read several letters of Mr. Banks, in reply to invitations to attend Republican meetings, but how studiously he omits the slightest word suggestive of a conflict with Slavery or the Slave Power! The terms are not used, while much is said about conciliation, union, power, &c. And let us not be thought captious when we note with regret a similar omission in the letter of Col. Fremont, lately published in the Era, and so greatly eulogized by the New York Evening Post and the Tribune. That letter shows that the sympathies of the writer are with his old friend, Governor Robinson, and with the people of Kansas, in their effort to establish a free government, but nothing more. It states no principle, lays down no line of policy, defines in no respect Colonel Fremont's position in regard to the question of slavery. In fact, that question is not named in the letter. . . . For one," continues the editor, "we cannot be drawn into a fight on mere transient incidental questions." "Let the Philadelphia Convention resolve—

1. That Congress has the right to prohibit slavery in all Federal Territories, and ought to exercise it.

2. That Kansas is of right and in fact free, and ought to be admitted at once as a free State:

Then, nominate men for the Presidency and Vice Presidency, who will be just as explicit and emphatic in their declarations as these resolves are—

And then, we can all work together, heart and hand. Let it dodge the great Principle, in its resolves or nominees, and we see not how any honest, clear-sighted man, who understands the real Evil of the country, and the exigencies of the crisis, can take any special interest in the contest."

Here, again, it will be noticed that the Era is not so stiff and unaccommodating as to insist upon, or even to mention, the old Free-soil issue of "no more slave States." Must we infer that, by common consent, that plank of the old platform is to be relinquished? Has Senator Douglass (taking advantage of the Free Soil

concession of constitutional slavery in the States) compelled their retreat from that fortress? The Philadelphia Convention must indeed be far gone, if it cannot come up to the demands of the Era.

In a previous article the editor of the Era notes down the "Lesson of (the last) Sixteen Years," showing how, at every step, and in every instance, the policy of running after supposed "availability," has proved a miserable failure. We think we could make some important additions to his statements, but he has given quite enough to justify his conclusions, and give force to his warnings, which run on this wise—

"Gentlemen, beware! Four great facts are before you. Possibly, one more fact may be needed to demonstrate that bold and direct remedies are the best; that compromise and evasion can answer no purpose but to bring strength to slavery and weakness and defeat to its opponents."

#### "IS GREELEY AMONG THE RADICALS?"

The following has already been read with astonishment by scores of thousands. Let the readers of the Tribune quiet themselves. They are destined to see stranger things than these.

#### "GEN. GRANGER'S SPEECH.

"Editorial Correspondence of the New York Tribune.

"Washington, Friday, April 4, 1856.

"The speech of Gen. A. P. Granger in the House to-day was, in its character and influences, striking exemplification of the power of directness, purpose, correctness and common sense.(1) We have had many graceful orations this session in either House, by men of liberal education, thorough political training, and consummate oratory, to which the curious or unemployed listened for a few moments, turned to a neighbor, and observed, 'He is doing very well,' or 'That was neatly put,' and sauntered off to look at the paintings in the Rotunda, or chat with some fair acquaintance in the gallery.(2) But to-day there arose in the House a plain, unassuming member, who has passed the meridian of life without ever till now sitting in a legislative hall or filling a prominent station, who is not a fluent speaker and makes no effort at oratorical display, and who had been three months in the House without claiming its attention for more than fifteen minutes in all. Yet, from the moment he began to speak, all were resolute to stay and eager to hear; and, though the boldness and novelty of his positions excited some manifestations of dissent and even of derision, while Southern gladiators were on the alert to make party capital out of his views and statements, yet he was heard with absorbed attention to the end.

"And well he might be; for he travelled in no beaten track, said what had not been said before him, and used no more words than were needed to set forth his convictions. Such speakers, who meditate what they say and how most clearly and tersely to say it, will never lack attentive auditors.

"Forty times this session, as at many former sessions, we have had speeches which coolly assumed that slavery is under the special protection of the Federal Constitution—that this was a controlling purpose with the framers of that instrument—that whatever militates against slavery wars on the spirit of the Constitution.

(3) From the general tenor of the Nebraska speeches, one might fairly infer that, but for the need of fortifying slavery, there would have been no Constitution. But Gen. Granger met all this to-day by a plump denial of the alleged pro-slavery character of the National Charter.

(4) On the contrary, he maintained that the Constitution, in several of its fundamental provisions, secures liberty to every innocent human being, and so forbids the enslavement of

any.(5) No one who follows Gen. Granger's citations and arguments can doubt that, if this were the constitution of some forgotten republic of antiquity just recovered and submitted to learned publicists to determine its true character, they must unanimously pronounce it incompatible with the existence of slavery.(6) We can only make it pro-slavery by considering who were its framers, by whom they were elected, and what must have been their intent; for if we were to interpret the Constitution by itself alone, we must understand it as General Granger does(7) And that, a generation hence, when public sentiment shall have been enlightened and purified, may very probably be the general interpretation.(8) Let the American people come to hate slavery as they ought, and we shall need no Abolition acts, for the Judiciary will deal with it as Portia did with Shylock's 'pound of flesh.'(9) There must always be law enough in a republic to sweep away slavery whenever the Judges can afford to discern and apply it.(10.)

"Gen. Granger's speech will be the cause of many others, and skilful efforts will be made to hold the 'Black Republicans' responsible for it. I trust these will insure it a wide circulation at the South. H. G."

#### NOTES.

(1) Aye! And of the power of truth, and of the 'single eye' that discerns it—we will add.

(2) A truthful picture, no doubt, of the effect of half-way orations against the Slave Power. This confirms what was said of them in our Call for a Nominating Convention, viz. "They can awaken no enthusiasm, and call up no response."

(3) Yes. And "forty times" the assumption has gone unrebuked. "Forty times" too, perhaps, it has been virtually conceded by the "Republican" speakers—as it was, indeed, by the late Pittsburg Convention.

(4) Yes! Mr. H. G.—and this is the only way in which such assumptions ever can be met.

(5.) This position follows, consecutively, the preceding one. The Constitution cannot be neutral.

(6) This concession gives us our entire argument. The Constitution IS what its words make it, and it is nothing else.

(7) "Who were its framers?" Aye! who were they? Were they such creatures as Pierce, Douglas, Atchinson, and Stringfellow? Let the Declaration of Independence—the previous Articles of Association—the Ordinance of 1787—and let the Preamble of the Constitution answer. But, were they the veriest hypocrites and scoundrels on earth (as the anti-abolition construction assumes them to have been) they were not and are not "the Constitution of the United States." The Constitution speaks for itself, and IS what it declares itself to be.

(8) This is the precise work of the American Abolition Society.

(9) In other words—"Let the people come to hate slavery as they ought," and they will be Radical Abolitionists, with a Radical Abolitionist Judiciary to put down slavery.

(10) Yes, and if the Judiciary fail to do this, it will of course devolve on the Legislature to make such enactments as will oblige the Judiciary to do their duty.

When Horace Greeley predicts the success of Radical Abolitionism, it is no time for Radi-

\* We cannot help noticing, here, that not even the editor of the Era demands a "Republican" platform that shall distinctly insist on the Free Soil motto of "No more Slave States."

cal Abolitionists to be discouraged, nor to tack themselves on, as the tail to somebody-else's kite.

The Tribune publishes "the bold and manly speech of General Granger" with renewed commendations, but adds—

"While holding these extreme views, we are confident that General Granger will never be found serving the slave-breeding and slave-trading propaganda by refusing to co-operate with the great mass of the people in the practical effort to save Kansas to Freedom," &c., &c.

Gen. Granger can speak for himself. For ourselves, we hold none of our principles in abeyance, as idle abstractions. We never yet witnessed the first instance of the good policy of so doing.

One point of progress is here to be chronicled. *Our theory of the Constitution is conceded to be truthful.* The only remaining question is, whether TRUTH or FALSEHOOD can best shape our measures, and guide our activities, in our "practical" endeavors! Ask Arkwright and Fulton how they found it?

#### "THE WHITE MAN'S PARTY."

The Circular of the National Committee, appointed at the late Pittsburg Convention, vindicates the "Republican" party from the opprobrium of being 'black Republicans,' by saying,

"In their arrogance they stigmatize as black Republicans those who would make a constellation of free bright republics, CONSTITUTED OF THE WHITE RACE ALONE."

In the Hartford (Ct.) Courant, the same idea is expanded as follows:

"*Republicanism is the white man's party.* It is not because we feel any burning zeal in the black man's cause, that we resist the progress of slavery in this country. We like the white man better than we do the black. We believe the Caucasian variety of the human species superior to the Negro variety—and we would breed the best stock, and fill this noble land of ours—this broad country which the Almighty seems to have providentially preserved as a blank sheet, upon which the noblest and loftiest thoughts only can be properly inscribed—with the noblest race of human beings possible. Color is not the trouble; thick lips and woolly hair are not the objections. It is, that the Caucasian variety is intrinsically a better breed, of better brain, better moral traits, better capacity every way, than the Negro, or the Mongolian, or the Malay, or the Red American. If the Negro race had the mental superiority, we should consider the color, hair, or odor, matters of no account. To our minds, the Republican cause is intrinsically aristocratic; it aims to save the country to the white man. The Republicans mean to preserve all of this country that they can from the pestilential presence of the black man."

We suppose, then, it will be understood that colored voters, and those who stand up for the equal rights of the colored people, will not be expected nor invited to vote in "the white man's party."

Since preparing the preceding, we have met with several expressions, from different quarters, of the same unchristian and anti-republican sentiment, from advocates of the so-called "Republican" party. At their "great meeting in the Tabernacle," (New York) April 30, as reported in the Tribune, Mr. W. W. Evarts, defined the position of his party to be that "no more territory should be occupied by mixed races." And again—

"It (the Territory) has been won by the common blood and treasure of the white men of the United States; and if God assists the efforts (!) that we commence this night, it shall be occupied by the white men of the whole country." "Carry through this campaign the principle that the land of the Uni-

ted States is enclosed in straight lines, belonging to the white citizens of the United States." "We are comprehensive (!) in our principles, not sectional. Now, white men live all over the country, but black men are geographically situated."

And so, the Free Soil motto of "Freedom national, and Slavery sectional," has dwindled down to "the white race national, the black race sectional"! The old Democratic party, so-called, with a democracy defined by color-phobia, is to be displaced by the new "Republican" party, so called, with a republicanism based upon color-phobia! The mountain in labor is to bring forth a mouse.

"Strange that such difference there should be,  
Twixt tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee!"

#### POSITION DEFINED.

The following Letter should have been published with the Call of our Convention, but was crowded out, in the first place, and afterwards inadvertently overlooked.

MYSTIC BRIDGE, CON., March 18, 1856.  
Messrs. Gerrit Smith, Lewis Tappan, William Goodell, and others:

Gentlemen—Your Circular of February 27 is before me. In reply, I am entirely convinced that the Republican party, although earnestly and honestly opposed to the extension of slavery, is nevertheless not able to abolish it. Thus far I agree with you—and farther, that if any political party can claim the co-operation of the Christian man and woman, yours is that party. But I frankly acknowledge that some doubts do exist in my mind, whether any Christian can consistently co-operate and sustain any political party which falls back on the war power as its last resort to sustain it, or that requires a seeming violation (at least) of that portion of the divine record which prohibits the taking of an oath.

I am by profession a subject of Him who is King of kings, as well as Lord of lords. Now if obedience to Him forbids the use of carnal weapons, and oath-taking, then surely I could not pursue any course inconsistent therewith. I know that a general opinion prevails that slavery cannot be stayed except by political action. This may be true. Yet I believe the moral power of primitive Christianity not only held oppression in check, but also rolled back its raging wave. With all respect, therefore, to those who more fully sympathize with the Radical Abolitionist party, I almost feel assured that, ere the complete emancipation of mankind (and particularly that of the black man) transpires, the thunders of the Higher Law must be made to reverberate through the ear and heart of every aider and abettor of oppression.

And yet, gentlemen, I truly admire your Spartan few that have dared to wrest the Constitution of our Government from its pro-slavery interpretation. By so doing, you will do a work for which generations yet unborn will rise up and call you blessed. For the day is not far distant, when, unless, not only the Constitution, but the Bible, must be rescued from their pro-slavery and warlike interpretation, or they will be succeeded by others better adapted to perfect both Church and State.

In conclusion, I most earnestly desire that every man in the nation who believes political action not inconsistent with true Christianity, may join your ranks. And then, not only will

the days of compromises be numbered, but the days of American slavery also; than which no event, except the full establishment of the Redeemer's kingdom on earth, would more gladden my heart.

With the above explanation, you are at liberty to use my name, in the Call for a Mass Convention at Syracuse, N. Y., on the 28th of May next.

With much respect, I am, gentlemen,  
Yours truly,  
S. S. GRISWOLD.

We regret that the following reached us too late for our last issue—

For the Radical Abolitionist.

#### NOMINATING CONVENTION.

Friend Goodell—We see by the Radical Abolitionist, that there is to be a Convention of "Radical Abolitionists," held at Syracuse, N. Y., on the 28th of May next, for the purpose of placing in nomination, candidates for President and Vice President of the United States.

Feeling an anxiety to have a voice in the matter, we ask it of you as a favor, to publish, in your paper, these few lines, together with the names attached. We have hitherto co-operated with the Republican party, so-called; but in consequence of the abandonment of ALL principles, by this party, at its Convention at Pittsburgh in February last, a conscientious sense of duty impels us to cast in our lot with the Radical Abolitionists—the only Abolition party in the country.

The so-called Republican party have evidently retrograded, having abandoned their much-vaunted doctrine of "No more Slave States," and reduced the issue to the opposition and overthrow of the present National Administration, and the "immediate admission of Kansas into the Union, as a free, sovereign, independent State." This is narrowing down the issue too much for anti-slavery men—men who love liberty—men who love their country—men who feel a sympathy for the poor, oppressed, of his-manhood robbed slave. The so-called Republicans, as they now stand before the country, are not anti-slavery; they are not even anti-extension, their anti-extension and non-extension being confined to Kansas alone.

We are pleased to see so many signers to your call, from the several States, and especially from our own State, and hope that you will have a large, harmonious, and inflexible Convention. Nominate thorough-going, Radical candidates, and they will receive such a vote as will astonish those revelling on the low ground of "Slavery in the States."

Williams Co. O. April 16, '56.

W. A. Hunter, J. A. Sinder, Amos Betts, Henry Gilbert, W. A. Ouer, S. J. Hoot, Nathan Edwards, L. L. Baldwin, F. L. Bogle, Abraham Hoot, Eli Booth, H. Ayers, B. F. Rockwell, Richard Russell, George U. Tuillieratz, Stanley Kent, J. C. Richardson, O. W. Sawyer, R. G. Richardson, W. A. Hinman, Eli Anderson, Isaac Grant, R. Hinman, John Marshal, S. Sincer.

W. A. HUNTER.—We are happy to learn that W. A. Hunter, Esq., who lately conducted, with such signal ability, the Republican Standard, at Bryan, Williams County, O., contemplates starting a Radical Abolition paper at COLUMBUS, the seat of the State Government of Ohio. We heartily bid him God speed, and earnestly commend him and his enterprise to the support of Radical Abolitionists at the West.

# SENATOR DOUGLAS AND THE "RE-PUBLICANS."

SENATE, March 12.—Mr. Douglas, Chairman of the Committee on Territories, made a report on Kansas affairs. He reviews the history of the introduction and progress of slavery in this country, and the constitutional relations it assumes. He says, *new States have the right to come in with any domestic laws and institutions not conflicting with the Constitution.* This principle, he says, was embodied in the Kansas-Nebraska Bill. [N. Y. Tribune, 13th Mar.]

We well remember that this *was* the main argument urged by Senator Douglas and others in Congress, and responded to by the New York Journal of Commerce, and other papers of that class, during the discussion of the Kansas-Nebraska bill. We remember saying, in our little paper, (the American Jubilee) that the premises of these gentlemen were correct, and that their pro-slavery inferences and applications of the doctrine could, in no way, be avoided, but by insisting that Slavery in the States does conflict with the Federal Constitution. We predicted—amid the sneers of our cotemporaries—that unless this defence were set up, the Nebraska iniquity would be consummated. The prediction soon became history. From that day to this, the doctrine of the equality of the new States with the old, has been steadily gaining ground in the public mind. The country is fast settling down upon it as an axiomatic truth. And since the prominent opposers of the Nebraska bill still persist in their false reasoning, and constructively deny the equality of the States, instead of affirming the unconstitutionality of slavery in the States, their cause, in the public mind, is continually losing ground, until, at the late Pittsburg Convention, the Anti-Nebraska party itself has virtually abandoned the position, by striking out from their flag the motto of "No more Slave States!" With their exposition of the Constitution, they dare not go before the people on that issue! And so they have abandoned it, altogether. It only needs a few more turns of the logical screw of Senator Douglas to make them abandon the defence of freedom in the Territories, unless they can rise to the dignity and consistency of denying the constitutionality of slavery in the States. All this is plain to the comprehension of a schoolboy. Why then, the farce of getting up a Presidential Nomination, when they are so rapidly giving up all the issues which can give their nomination any significance? Do they think to rally the North, abolitionists and all, upon the paltry issue whether freedom shall be "crushed out" *a la mode de FRANK PIERCE*, or whether it shall be conducted to its "finale"—*a la mode de FRANK BLAIR*?

## SINGULAR COMMENDATION.

The Republican party, far as it is from the ideal of an Anti-Slavery political party, is still, on the whole, an advance on the parties of an Anti-Slavery complexion that went before it. From defeat and disappointment, which must needs be the lot of such men, even if they could succeed in their immediate aim, many of them must go on from strength to strength. Many of them, unquestionably, are ready for much more radical measures, did they but see that the time had come for them. [N. A. S. Standard, April 12.]

The Liberty party of 1840 "went before" the Republican party. It declared direct war upon Slavery. It demanded the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia and Territories, and of the inter-state Slave-trade. It was

preparing to go for "much more radical measures," namely: the National Abolition of Slavery in the States, and all that was left of it, after the desertion of the majority into the Free Soil party, *did* take and has maintained that ground. The Free Soil party of 1848 ignored action on the inter-state slave-trade, and Slavery in the District of Columbia, but demanded "No more slave States and no more slave territory." The "Free Democracy" of 1852 did the same, and added the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Bill of 1850, and the protection of colored seamen. Last comes "this Republican party." It neither asks for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, nor for the suppression of the inter-State slave trade, nor for the repeal or even modification of the Fugitive Slave Bill, nor for the protection of colored seamen. It even rejects the issue of "no more Slave States!" It only attempts "to secure the repeal of all laws which allow the introduction of slavery into territories once consecrated to freedom,—demands freedom for Kansas, and "will resist by every lawful means, the existence of slavery in any of the Territories belonging to the United States."

Yet "the Standard" of American Anti-Slavery says, "This Republican party, far as it is from the ideal of an Anti-Slavery party, is still, on the whole, an advance on the parties of an anti-slavery complexion that went before it!" Verily! Tastes differ. What "party, of an anti-slavery complexion, that went before it," ever took so low a ground? Which of them was presided over by a slaveholder? Which of them greeted with loud applause, the reading of a document, from the pen of its slaveholding President, a "Southern platform" designed to restore "the Missouri Compromise" "as the security of the slave institution"—"the finale of all existing commotions?"

But the Standard says it "must go on, from strength to strength." "Many of them, unquestionably, are ready for much more radical measures, *did* they but see that the time had come for them!" That is, "they are ready," only they are *not* yet "ready." Clear as mud. And what "more radical measures" are they ready for, in the future tense? The non-admission of new slave States? The repeal of the Fugitive Slave bill? The protection of colored seamen? The interdiction of the internal slave trade? The abolition of slavery in the Federal District? And in the States? Either or all of these, would be "more radical measures" than could find effective advocacy at the late Pittsburg Convention. But then, either or all of them would carry "this Republican party" back to "the parties of an anti-slavery complexion that went before it."

The Standard is right, when, in the same article, it says, "The business of abolitionists is to criticize all half-way covenants, to point out their inherent weakness, and to show a more excellent way."

ENCOURAGING.—"One thing I must say, the Radical Abolitionist converts three-fourths of all who read it." So writes a correspondent from Iowa. Here is encouragement for the Editor—encouragement for the Committee—encouragement for the Society—encouragement for contributors to its funds—encouragement for individuals to subscribe for the paper, and order it sent to their friends, as many are already doing.

## DISCLAIMER OF THE N. Y. TRIBUNE.

The Hon. Stephen A. Douglas has lately devoted a large share of his attention to the party which he, with his average suavity and breeding, denominates "Black Republican." In one of his late speeches in the Senate, (4th inst.), he says:

"The Black Republican party was organized and founded on the fundamental principle of perfect and entire equality of rights and privileges between the negro and the white man—an equality secured and guaranteed by a law higher than the Constitution of the United States. In your creed, as proclaimed to the world, you stand pledged against 'the admission of any more Slave States';

"To repeal the Fugitive Slave law;  
"To abolish the slave-trade between the States;  
"To prohibit Slavery in the District of Columbia;  
"To restore the prohibition on Kansas and Nebraska; and

"To acquire no more territory unless Slavery shall be first prohibited.

"This is your creed authoritatively proclaimed."

—Of course, we do not ask the Little Giant on what authority he says this is the "creed proclaimed to the world," of the Republican party, for Truth and Douglas are not on speaking terms, and we ought to be thankful that he does not charge us with advocacy of Slavery Extension and complicity with the Border Ruffians. The Address and Resolves of the Republican National Convention at Pittsburg, with the Circular and Call of the Central Committee formed by that Convention, were before him; but they contained nothing to serve his turn; so he trusted to his faculty of invention, which never fails him.—N. Y. Tribune, 18th April.

This confirms the statements made in our paper, and justifies the "Call" of our Nominating Convention.

The Tribune quotes Mr. Douglas still farther, as saying:

"There are rumors afloat \* \* \* that you propose to throw overboard all the bold men who distinguished themselves in your service in fighting the Anti-Nebraska fight, and to take a new man, who in consequence of not being committed to either side, will be enabled to cheat somebody by getting votes from both sides! Rumor says that all your veteran generals who have received scars and wounds in the Anti-Nebraska campaign are now considered unfit to command, and are to be laid aside in order to take up some new man who has not antagonized with the great principles of self-government and State equality."

The Tribune does not deny this, but rather confirms it, by saying:

"In selecting candidates for the contest at hand, we shall ask—Who are heartily for Free Kansas? Who among these can command the largest Popular and Electoral vote?"

Suppose he were a Slaveholder—a supporter of the Fugitive Slave bill, and of Slavery in the Federal District, as well as in the States—would it be either morally right, or politically prudent, to elect such a man President?

THE MAY ANNIVERSARIES have come and gone—not without some agitation of vexed questions.

The American Tract Society, after an animated debate, appointed a committee of investigation, to report at the next meeting, but, in the mean time, the old committee was re-elected—not even excepting the Rev. Dr. "South-side" Adams. It is to be hoped that the "Report" will not overlook so significant an item in the history of the Society, and that if the Society is to have an anti-slavery literature, it will not commit the supervision of it to pro-slavery men.

The American Anti-Slavery Society, on the first day of its meeting, discussed and adopted a set of quite "radical" resolutions, eight in number, declaring its object to be, not mere non-extension, but the entire abolition of American Slavery, and containing nothing about a dissolution of the Union—nor anything to which all thorough abolitionists could not heartily respond. On the second day, Mr. Garrison read six additional resolutions which, we understand,

OUR NEW PUBLICATIONS.—“Granger’s Speech in Congress,” and “Review of Apologies for the Tract Society,” announced in our last paper, are now published. (See Catalogue.) We have also received a fresh supply of the “Gospel Fruits.”

**CLE TO THE CONVERSION OF THE WORLD**  
A prize Tract of 24 pages. Price \$3 per 100.  
Address WM. GOODELL, 48 Beekman street New York.

---

**TOBITT'S COMBINATION-TYPE, 181 WILLIAM**

TOBITT'S COMBINATION-TYPE, 181 WILLIAM

TOBITT'S COMBINATION-TYPE, 181 WILLIAM